



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,289	09/08/2000	Matthew D. Saylor	13DV13218	3536

6111 7590 07/02/2002

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY  
ANDREW C HESS  
GE AIRCRAFT ENGINES  
ONE NEUMANN WAY M/D H17  
CINCINNATI, OH 452156301

EXAMINER

LEE, RIP A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1713

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/658,289

Applicant(s)

SAYLOR ET AL.

Examiner

Rip A. Lee

Art Unit

1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-4 in Paper No. 3 is acknowledged. The Applicants submit that two-way distinctness between invention I (subcombination) and invention II (combination) has not been shown. This is not found persuasive. Both criteria listed in MPEP § 806.05(c) have for showing two-way distinctness have been met. The combination does not require the particulars of the subcombination because it does not use catalyst component (c). The Applicants believe that the claimed coating mixture would not have separate utility as a self-supporting film because the claims are drawn to a coating mixture "for protecting aircraft and aircraft engine components." There is no reason to believe that the coating mixture can not be used in other combinations (*i.e.*, for coating an automobile engine), and the Applicants have not proffered evidence to the contrary.

Regarding distinctness between inventions I and III and inventions II and III, the Applicants merely submit that the requisite serious burden does not appear to exist. However, the Applicants concur that the "inventions may have separate classifications (page 2, line 16)." According to MPEP, when inventions are shown to be distinct and have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes is proper.

In summary, the requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

*Claim Objections*

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word liquid has been written twice in line 5. Appropriate correction is required.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claim recites use of a third, catalyst component in the coating mixture. There is no description of such a material in the specifications other than "a suitable catalyst" on page 3, line 19. The word "catalyst" appears on page 2, but this is merely a recitation of the claims. The nature of a catalyst varies greatly. All sorts of organic compounds and inorganic compounds, electromagnetic radiation of various wavelengths, and even air or water may catalyze reactions. Therefore, without further qualification, even one with skill in the coatings art would not be able to make the claimed coating mixture.

Art Unit: 1713

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim states that a catalyst is used for "enabling the chemical reaction of said latex containing liquid." It is unclear what the chemical reaction entails or constitutes.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claims 1-4 are under 35 U.S.C. 102(b as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,390,658 to Graetz *et al.*

The prior art of Graetz *et al.* relates to coating compositions comprising a latex (col. 7, line 19). By definition, a latex contains liquid. The latices of the invention are prepared in distilled water (col. 7, line 34). The solids content of the latex is from 50-70 % by weight (col. 3, line 53). Compositions of the invention may also contain catalysts (col. 6, lines 11-15). Optionally, the compositions may also contain one or more pigments (col. 5, lines 1-3). Titanium dioxide is used as the pigment (col. 8, line 40). The composition may be applied by spraying (col. 6, line 56). Thus, the composition of the present invention is anticipated by the prior art.

Graetz *et al.* is silent with respect to the viscosity of the coating compositions. The claimed range of 50-400 cP is unexceptional, and this is an expected range for such coatings. This point notwithstanding, the prior art composition encompasses the claimed features of the present invention, and the prior composition is also sprayable. Thus, a reasonable basis exists to

Art Unit: 1713


believe that the coating compositions of Graetz *et al.* possess the same rheological properties. Since the PTO can not conduct experiments, the burden of proof is shifted to the Applicants to provide evidence to the contrary, and to establish an unobviousness difference. *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d. 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112-2112.02.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rip A. Lee whose telephone number is (703)306-0094. The examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (703)308-2450. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)746-7064. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

ral

June 27, 2002

  
DAVID W. WU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700